



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/196,029 11/19/98 NEMOTO

H TRW(VSSIM)24

┌

PM82/0906

└

STEPHEN D SCANLON  
TAROLLI SUNDHEIM COVELL TUMMINO & SZABO  
1111 LEADER BUILDING  
526 SUPERIOR AVENUE  
CLEVELAND OH 44114-1400

EXAMINER

DICKSON, P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3618

12

DATE MAILED: 09/06/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/196,029

Applicant(s)

NEMOTO, HIROSHI

Examiner

Paul N. Dickson

Art Unit

3618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2000.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 16-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 16-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
1. ☐ received.
2. ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 3618

### DETAILED ACTION

1. The reissue oath/declaration filed with this application is defective because it fails to contain a statement that all errors which are being corrected in the reissue application up to the time of filing and during the prosecution of the reissue application arose without any deceptive intention on the part of the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.175 and MPEP § 1414.

2. Claims 1-10 and 16-18 are rejected as being based upon a defective reissue declaration under 35 U.S.C. 251 as set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.175.

3. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based. See *Hester Industries, Inc. v. Stein, Inc.*, 142 F.3d 1472, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Clement*, 131 F.3d 1464, 45 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Ball Corp. v. United States*, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 295 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A broadening aspect is present in the reissue which was not present in the application for patent. The record of the application for the patent shows that the broadening aspect (in the reissue) relates to subject matter that applicant previously surrendered during the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, the narrow scope of the claims in the patent was not an error within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 251, and the broader scope surrendered in the application for the patent cannot be recaptured by the filing of the present reissue application.

4. Claims 16-18 are broader than any of the original claims by the omission of at least the following limitation which was surrendered in the application for the patent:

not  
required  
unit 1 =  
see  
1494

Art Unit: 3618

a. the limitation that the apparatus comprises an inner cover, the inner cover having a first tear seam.

The record constitutes an admission by the applicant that the limitation was necessary to overcome the prior art. Reference is made to the amendment filed May 28, 1996, page 2, 2<sup>nd</sup> full paragraph. Reference is made to the amendment filed December 11, 1995, the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6, specifically page 5, lines 21-26 and page 6, lines, 4-11. Reference is made to the amendment filed December 11, 1995, page 6, lines 14-27.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed August 21, 2000 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues that no subject matter has been surrendered by the referenced arguments as such arguments are "a general statement regarding the claims as a whole and specific to no one limitation (i.e., a "boiler plate" format)." The examiner maintains that the referenced arguments are specific to the inner cover and the first tear seam.

Particular reference is made, but not limited to the amendment filed December 11, 1995, page 6, lines 14-27 wherein the applicant states:

None of the prior art...suggests an apparatus comprising an inner cover including means for defining a first tear seam in the inner cover... wherein the first layer includes a first portion with a first tear line aligned with the first and second tear seams in the inner and outer covers and the second layer includes a second portion...with a second tear line aligned with the first and second tear seams in the inner and outer covers

***Conclusion***

6. The examiner notes that should only the original claims 1-10 remain in the application, the application will be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as there would be no errors in the patent to provide grounds for the reissue of the patent. Accordingly, the patent will not be reissued.

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul N. Dickson whose telephone number is (703) 308-2089. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-4:00, Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian L. Johnson can be reached on (703) 308-0885. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 3618

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1134.



Paul N. Dickson  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3618

9/5/00

pnd  
September 5, 2000